

**REMARKS**

Claims 8-14, 17-20, 23-37, 43-51, and 54-56 are pending in this application.

Applicants have amended claims 8, 13, 17, 28, 30, 34, 36, 43, 45, and 54-56, and have canceled claims 15 and 16. As will be explained in more detail below, the changes to the claims made herein do not introduce any new matter.

**Claim Amendments**

Applicants have amended the independent claims to clarify the information that designates the color space information to be used in color space conversion of the image data from an input color space to an output color space. In particular, Applicants have amended the independent claims to specify information that designates color space conversion of the image data from an input color space to an output color space “without first being converted to an intermediate color space.” Support for this feature can be found in Applicants’ specification at, for example, Figure 9 and the accompanying discussion of this figure (see Paragraphs [0101]-[0103] in the published version of the subject application (US 2002/0027603 A1)).

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 8, 13, 15, 17, 28, 30, 34, 36, 43, 45, and 54-56 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement (as noted above, claim 15 has been canceled). In support of the rejection, the Examiner asserts that Applicants’ specification would not reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventors had possession, at the time the application was filed, of the claimed feature that the color space information is different from the color space at the time of image data generation. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The feature to which the Examiner has objected has been added to the claims to distinguish the claimed subject matter from the Examiner’s characterization of the prior art

references. Upon reading Applicants' specification, it would be readily apparent to one having ordinary skill in the art that the "color space information" of the claimed subject matter is not the same as the "color space" of image data at the time the image data is generated. Thus, Applicants' specification provides adequate written description support for the presently claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 8, 13, 17, 28, 30, 34, 36, 43, 45, and 54-56 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 8, 11-15, 17, 18, 23, 27-30, 33-36, 43, 45, 51, and 54-56 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kuno et al.* ("Kuno") (US 6,538,242 B1) in view of *Ohkubo* (US 7,136,187 B1) (as noted above, claim 15 has been canceled). As will be explained in more detail below, the combination of the *Kuno* and *Ohkubo* references would not have rendered the presently claimed subject matter obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art.

As noted above, Applicants have amended the independent claims to specify information that designates color space conversion of the image data from an input color space to an output color space "without first being converted to an intermediate color space."

Both *Kuno* and *Ohkubo* have to carry out two color conversions: one color conversion with the characteristics of the input device and another color conversion with the characteristics of the output device. In contrast, using the presently claimed subject matter one only has to carry out one color conversion to convert the color space of the image data from the color space of the input device to the color space of the output device. Thus, the presently claimed subject matter increases the efficiency with which color conversion can be performed.

In view of the foregoing, even if the *Kuno* and *Ohkubo* references were to be combined in the manner proposed by the Examiner, the result of this combination would not have included each and every feature of the presently claimed subject matter. As such, the combination of *Kuno* in view of *Ohkubo* would not have rendered the presently claimed subject matter obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, independent claims 8, 13, 17, 28, 30, 34, 36, 43, 45, and 54-56, as amended herein, are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Kuno* in view of *Ohkubo*. The dependent claims are likewise patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Kuno* in view of *Ohkubo* for at least the same reasons set forth above regarding the applicable independent claim.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 9, 10, 19, 20, 31, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kuno* in view of *Ohkubo*, and further in view of *Nakajima* (US 6,650,437 B1). Each of claims 9, 10, 19, 20, 31, and 32 depends from one of independent claims 8, 17, and 30. The deficiencies of the combination of the *Kuno* and *Ohkubo* references relative to the subject matter specified in present independent claims 8, 17, and 30 are discussed above. The *Nakajima* reference does not cure the above-discussed deficiencies of the combination of the *Kuno* and *Ohkubo* references relative to the presently claimed subject matter. Accordingly, claims 9, 10, 19, 20, 31, and 32 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Kuno* in view of *Ohkubo*, and further in view of *Nakajima* for at least the same reasons set forth above regarding claims 8, 17, and 30.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 37, 44, and 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kuno* in view *Ohkubo*, and further in view of *Anabuki et al.* (“*Anabuki*”) (US 6,441,913 B1). Claims 37, 44, and 46 depend from claims 36, 43, and 45, respectively. The deficiencies of the combination of the *Kuno* and

*Ohkubo* references relative to the subject matter specified in present independent claims 36, 43, and 45 are set forth above. The *Anabuki* reference does not cure the above-discussed deficiencies of the combination of the *Kuno* and *Ohkubo* references relative to the presently claimed subject matter. Accordingly, claims 37, 44, and 46 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Kuno* in view of *Ohkubo*, and further in view of *Anabuki* for at least the same reasons set forth above regarding claims 36, 43, and 45.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 26 and 47-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kuno* in view of *Ohkubo*, and further in view of *Buhr et al.* (US 5,528,339). Each of dependent claims 26 and 47-50 ultimately depends from one of independent claims 17 and 45. The deficiencies of the combination of the *Kuno* and *Ohkubo* references relative to the subject matter specified in present independent claims 17 and 45 are set forth above. The *Buhr et al.* reference does not cure the above-discussed deficiencies of the combination of the *Kuno* and *Ohkubo* references relative to the presently claimed subject matter. Accordingly, claims 26 and 47-50 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Kuno* in view of *Ohkubo*, and further in view of *Buhr et al.* for at least the same reasons set forth above regarding claims 17 and 45.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 16, 24, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kuno* in view of *Ohkubo*, and further in view of *Parulski et al.* (US 6,310,647 B1). Each of dependent claims 16, 24, and 25 ultimately depends from one of independent claims 15 and 17. The deficiencies of the combination of the *Kuno* and *Ohkubo* references relative to the subject matter specified in present independent claims 15 and 17 are set forth above. The *Parulski et al.* reference does not cure the above-discussed deficiencies of the combination of the *Kuno* and *Ohkubo* references relative to the presently claimed subject matter. Accordingly, claims 16, 24, and 25 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Kuno* in view of *Ohkubo*,

**Application No. 09/941,590**  
**Amendment dated March 10, 2009**  
**Response to Office Action dated December 10, 2008**

and further in view of *Parulski et al.* for at least the same reasons set forth above regarding claims 15 and 17.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of claims 8-14, 17-20, 23-37, 43-51, and 54-56, as amended herein, and submit that these claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at **(408) 749-6902**. If any additional fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. **MIPFP006**).

Respectfully submitted,  
**MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, L.L.P.**

/Peter B. Martine/

Peter B. Martine  
Reg. No. 32,043

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200  
Sunnyvale, California 94085  
**Customer Number 25920**